

**REMARKS**

***Status of the Claims***

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-16, 18, 19, 21-26, and 29-32 will be pending in the application. Of these, claims 1, 13 and 25 are independent. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9-13, 18, 19 and 21-25 are sought to be amended. Claims 5, 8, 17, 20, 27 and 28 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant believes that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

Claims 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the preamble of claim 25 to now recite “storing a computer program”. Claim 26 depends from claim 25. Claims 27 and 28 are sought to be cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103***

Claims 1-4, 8, 13-17 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,707,778). Claims 5-7, 9-12, 18-24 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Abe (U.S. Patent No. 6,965,723). Claims 5, 8, 17, 20, 27 and 28 are sought to be cancelled. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to the pending claims for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 13 and 25 have been amended to now recite similar subject matter of: determining a beginning time stamp for an edit segment in a digital recording, wherein the beginning time stamp is determined as a point in time in which an editing command starts; determining an ending time stamp for the edit segment in the digital recording, wherein the ending time stamp is determined as a point in time after the beginning time stamp

when the user sends an indication to stop editing; and receiving an indication from a user whether to modify the edit segment for subsequent viewing of the digital recording based on the beginning and ending time stamps.

Lin and Abe, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this claimed subject matter. For example, the Examiner points to Lin where it states: "For the purpose of performing a video edit, a user will commonly need to identify a segment of the bit-stream upon which the editing operation (e.g. delete) is to be performed." (See, Lin, col. 7, lines 60-63). Lin further states: "The process begins when a user marks a beginning and an end point defining a segment to which an editing operation is to be performed." (See, Lin, col. 8, lines 2-4). Thus, Lin simply states that a user will commonly need to identify a segment and mark a beginning and an end point defining the segment to which an editing operation is to be performed. Applicant respectfully asserts that Lin does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter of determining a beginning time stamp and an ending time stamp for an edit segment, wherein the beginning time stamp is determined as a point in time in which an editing command starts and wherein the ending time stamp is determined as a point in time after the beginning time stamp when the user sends an indication to stop editing. Lin further does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter of receiving an indication from a user whether to modify the edit segment for subsequent viewing of the digital recording based on the beginning and ending time stamps. A careful review of the entire Lin patent failed to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, as discussed above.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Abe does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. The Examiner points to Abe where it states: "The IN and OUT points are identified by the addresses in the disk, especially, by field (or frame) number in this case. If the user designates the IN and OUT data by time code, they are converted into the corresponding field numbers." (See, Abe, col. 8, lines 23-27). The Examiner states that this section of Abe teaches the claimed subject of wherein the beginning time stamp is determined as a point in time in which an editing command starts. Applicant respectfully disagrees. At best, Abe discusses the user designates the IN and OUT data by time code. This is different from the claimed subject matter of using a point in time in which an editing command starts to determine the beginning

time stamp. A careful review of the entire Abe patent failed to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, as discussed above.

Lin and Abe, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this claimed subject matter, as discussed above. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 13 and 25 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable from Lin and Abe, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Intel Corporation

Dated: January 24, 2008

/Molly A. McCall/ Reg. No. 46,126  
Molly A. McCall  
Intel Corporation  
c/o Intellevate, LLC  
P.O. Box 52050  
Minneapolis, MN 55402